

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

**IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Master File No. 3:07-CV-05944-JST

MDL No. 1917

This Order Relates To:

Electrograph Sys., Inc., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-01656;

Electrograph Sys., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05724;

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-06275;

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05727;

Office Depot, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-06276;

Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05726;

CompuCom Systems, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-06396;

Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-06397;

Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05723;

Dell Inc. and Dell Products L.P., v. Hitachi, Ltd., No. 13-cv-02171;

P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 12-cv-02648;

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION SUGGESTING REMAND

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
MOTION SUGGESTING REMAND**

Master File No. 3:07-md-05944-JST

1 *P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp.,*
2 *et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-
3 05725;

4 *Schultze Agency Servs., LLC v. Hitachi,*
5 *Ltd., et al.*, 12 No. 12-cv-02649;

6 *Schultze Agency Servs., LLC v. Technicolor*
7 *SA, et al.*, No. 13-cv-05668;

8 *Tech Data Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd.,*
9 *et al.*, No. 13-cv-00157

1 On April 12, Plaintiffs Electrograph Systems, Inc.; Electrograph Technologies, Corp.;
2 Office Depot, Inc.; CompuCom Systems, Inc.; Interbond Corporation of America; P.C. Richard &
3 Son Long Island Corporation; MARTA Cooperative of America, Inc.; ABC Appliance, Inc.;
4 Schultze Agency Services LLC on behalf of Tweeter Opco, LLC and Tweeter Newco, LLC; Tech
5 Data Corporation and Tech Data Product Management, Inc.; Dell Inc. and Dell Products L.P.; and
6 Costco Wholesale Corporation (collectively "Remand Plaintiffs") filed an administrative motion
7 for leave to file a motion suggesting remand. Defendants do not object to Remand Plaintiffs'
8 request for leave to file a motion suggesting remand.

9 The Court, having reviewed the motion and good cause appearing, hereby finds that the
10 request for leave to file a motion suggesting remand should be GRANTED.

11
12 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

13
14 Dated: _____

15 JON S. TIGAR
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28